

IN THE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS OF TENNESSEE
AT KNOXVILLE

ANTONIO J. BEASLEY, SR. v. STATE OF TENNESSEE

Appeal from the Criminal Court for Hamilton County
No. 264367 Barry A. Steelman, Judge

No. E2007-01795-CCA-R3-PC - Filed March 26, 2008

The petitioner, Antonio J. Beasley, Sr., appeals the Hamilton County Criminal Court's dismissal of his June 21, 2007 "motion [for] writ [of] error coram nobis," through which the petitioner apparently attacked a 1990 conviction of attempt to commit arson. The State of Tennessee has moved this court to summarily affirm the criminal court's order pursuant to Rule 20 of the Tennessee Rules of the Court of Criminal Appeals. We agree that the case is appropriate for disposition via Rule 20, and we affirm the order of the criminal court.

Tenn. R. App. P. 3 Appeal as of Right; Judgment of the Criminal Court Affirmed
Pursuant to Rule 20. Rules of the Court of Criminal Appeals

JAMES CURWOOD WITT, JR., J., delivered the opinion of the court, in which NORMA MCGEE OGLE and D. KELLY THOMAS, JR., JJ., joined.

Antonio J. Beasley, Sr., appellant, pro se.

Robert E. Cooper, Attorney General & Reporter; and Rachel West Harmon, Assistant Attorney General, for the appellee, State of Tennessee.

MEMORANDUM OPINION

The petitioner alleged in his motion for writ of error coram nobis that, in 1990, he pleaded guilty to an offense that did not exist, attempt to commit aggravated arson. He did not attach to his motion a copy of the judgment that imposed the allegedly invalid conviction.

“The writ of error coram nobis may be had within one (1) year after the judgment becomes final by petition presented to the judge at chambers or in open court, who may order it to operate as a supersedeas or not.” T.C.A. § 27-7-103 (2000). The petitioner claims he pleaded guilty to the conviction offense and did so in 1990. We find no indication in this court’s records that he appealed the 1990 conviction. We conclude that the 2007 motion for coram nobis relief is barred by Code section 27-7-103.

Treating the motion as one for habeas corpus relief avails the petitioner no benefit. He failed to comply with the mandatory technical requirements of Tennessee Code Annotated section 29-21-107. *See Summers v. State*, 212 S.W.3d 251, 261 (Tenn. 2007).

For these reasons, the case presents a proper case for summary action to affirm the criminal court’s order pursuant to this court’s Rule 20.

JAMES CURWOOD WITT, JR., JUDGE